

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

**JAMES E. STRONG,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**UNITED PETROLEUM  
TRANSPORTS, INC.,**

**Defendant.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Civil Action No. 4:22-cv-00136-O-BP**

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Before the Court are Magistrate Judge Ray’s Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation (the “FCR”) (ECF No. 164); Plaintiff’s Objection (ECF No. 165);<sup>1</sup> Defendant’s Response (ECF No. 166); and Plaintiff’s Reply (ECF No. 167). After reviewing all relevant matters of record in this case, including the FCR and objection thereto, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the undersigned District Judge believes that the FCR is correct, and the findings and conclusions therein are accepted as the findings and conclusions of the Court. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Defendant’s Motion (ECF No. 153) is **GRANTED**, and Plaintiff’s claims are **DISMISSED with prejudice**. Separate final judgment shall issue.

**SO ORDERED** on this **1st** day of **July, 2024**.

  
Reed O'Connor  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff’s Objection is untimely due to being filed fifteen days—not fourteen days—after issuance of the April 4, 2024 FCR. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2) (“Within 14 days after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations.”). Plaintiff’s Objection was physically stamped by the Clerk of Court as filed on April 19, 2024 and subsequently docketed that same day. The electronic docketing information confirms that Plaintiff’s Objection was both received and filed by the Clerk of Court on April 19, 2024. Because April 19, 2024 is fifteen days after issuance of the April 4, 2024 FCR, Plaintiff’s Objection is untimely.